

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

- I. Embodiments I, and VII, including a single connection point and a single vibration transmitting member, with an elastic support, excluding an elastic member.
- II. Embodiment II, including a single connection point and a single vibration transmitting member, with a non-elastic support, excluding an elastic member.
- III. Embodiment III, including two connection points, a single vibration transmitting member, excluding an elastic member.
- IV. Embodiment IV, including a single connection point, two vibration transmitting members (one connected to each of two diaphragms), excluding an elastic member.
- V. Embodiment V, including two connection points, two vibration transmitting members (one connected to each of two diaphragms), excluding an elastic member.
- VI. Embodiment VI, including a single connection point and a single vibration transmitting member, including an elastic member.

- VII. Embodiment VIII, including a single connection point and a single vibration transmitting member (being a coil spring), with an elastic support, excluding an elastic member.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

2. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species I:	Embodiments I, VII:	claims 1 and 7-11.
Species II:	Embodiment II:	claims 1 and 7-11.
Species III:	Embodiment III:	claims 1-3 and 7-11.
Species IV:	Embodiment IV:	claims 1, 4 and 7-11.
Species V:	Embodiment V:	claims 1-5 and 7-11
Species VI:	Embodiment VI:	claims 1 and 6-11.
Species VII:	Embodiment VIII:	claims 1 and 7-11.

The following claim(s) are generic to all species/subspecies: 1 and 7-11.

3. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: independent claim 1

is drawn to a piezoelectric element contained within a casing, and connected to a diaphragm, which is commonly used as a small form-factor loudspeaker (e.g. as taught by JP 58-008000 (already of record)). Numerous improvements have been suggested as improvements and described in the specification as Embodiments 1-8. As the common components between all embodiments are known in the art, each improvement, or combination thereof is considered a separate invention.

4. A telephone call was made to Norman Soloway on 22 September 2008 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JESSE A. ELBIN whose telephone number is (571)270-3710. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 5:00pm EDT.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Suhan Ni can be reached on (571) 272-7505. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. A. E./
Examiner, Art Unit 2615

/Suhan Ni/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614